

Re. Point V.

- 1 The document referred to in this Decision is as follows:
D1 : US 2002/194369 A1 (RAWLINS DIANA ET AL) 19. December
2002 (200212-19)

2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

- 2.1 The present application does not fulfill the requirements
of Article 33(1) PCT because the object of Claim 1 is not
new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses (the references in brackets relate
to this document):

Method for traffic restriction in a packet-oriented
network with of a plurality of links (Paragraph 40, Figure
4), in which

- for a group of data packets of a flow to be transmitted
over the network an authorization check relating to a link
is conducted (Paragraph 40), in which case
- the group of data packets is to enter into the network
at an ingress node (Paragraph 40, Figure 4),
- The authorization check is conducted by means of a limit
value $ILB(L,w)$ for the entire traffic which enters at the
ingress node and is routed over the link (Paragraph 40,
58-59, 66-67; Figure 4), and
- the transmission of the group of data packets is not
authorized if the authorization of the transmission would
lead to traffic on the link exceeding the limit value
($ILB(L,w)$) (Paragraph 40 58-59, 66-67, 72; . Figure 4).

3 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 2

- 3.1 The present application does not fulfill the requirements
of Article 33(1) PCT because the object of Claim 2 is not
new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses (the references in brackets relate to this document):

Method for traffic restriction in a packet-oriented network with of a plurality of links (Paragraph 40, Figure 4), in which

- for a group of data packets of a flow to be transmitted over the network an authorization check relating to a link is conducted (Paragraph 40), in which case
- the group of data packets is to leave the network at an egress node (Paragraph 40, Figure 4),
- the authorization check is conducted by means of a limit value ($ELB(L,w)$) for the entire traffic which leaves the network via the egress node and is routed via the link (Paragraph 40 58-59, 66-67, Figure 4), and
- the transmission of the group of data packets is not authorized if the authorization of the transmission would lead to traffic on the link exceeding the limit value ($ELB(L,w)$) (Paragraph 40, 58-59, 66-67, 72, Figure 4).

4 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 3-8

Claims 3-8 do not contain any features, which in combination with the features of any claim to which they relate, fulfill the requirements of the PCT in relation to novelty

- The methods with two links (claim 3) or all links (claim 4) are disclosed by D1 in Paragraph 40, 58-59, 66-67, 72; Figure 4.
- The method with of a limit value for overall traffic over the ingress node (Claim 5) or the egress node (claim 6) or with the two limit values (claim 7) are also disclosed by D1, Paragraph 40, 58-59, 66-67, 72, Figure 4.
- the marginal nodes (claim 8) are also cited as "edge

routers" in Paragraph 58-59,166, Figure 4.